REMARKS

In the Office Action dated February 7, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 10-12, 14, 15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C.§ 102(e) as being anticipated by Page et al. ("Page") (U.S Patent No. 6,589,314). The Examiner also rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Page as applied to claim 12, in view of legal precedent. The Examiner also rejected claims 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Page as applied to claims 15 and 17 in view of Yang ("Yang") (U.S. Patent No. 6,193,934). The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page. Finally, the Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page, as applied to claim 1, in view of McQuigg et al. ("McQuigg") (U.S. Patent No. 6,530,978).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 10-12, 14, 15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Page. As an attachment to this Reply, Applicants have submitted a Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131. This Declaration demonstrates that the subject matter disclosed and claimed in the present application was invented prior to December 6, 2001. Thus, Page does not qualify as prior art with respect to the present application. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 10-12, 14, 15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Page should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Page as applied to claim 12, in view of legal precedent. As noted above, the attached Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 submitted by the Applicants demonstrates that the subject matter disclosed and claimed in the present

2

application was invented prior to December 6, 2001. Thus, Page does not qualify as prior art with respect to the present application. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Page as applied to claims 15 and 17 in view of Yang. As noted above, the attached Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 submitted by the Applicants demonstrates that the subject matter disclosed and claimed in the present application was invented prior to December 6, 2001. Thus, Page does not qualify as prior art with respect to the present application. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Page should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page. As noted above, in view of the attached Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 submitted by the Applicants, Page does not qualify as prior art with respect to the present application. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page, as applied to claim 1, in view of McQuigg. As noted above, in view of the attached Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 submitted by the Applicants, Page does not qualify as prior art with respect to the present application. Accordingly, the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 5 should be withdrawn.

3

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 3, 2005

By:_____
Darren M. Jiron
Reg. No. 45,777

Attachments: Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131